Applicant ARDYTHE L. MORROW Attorney Docket No.: 50051-002 JSL

Serial No. : 10/581,759 Client Ref. No.: 2003-1201 Filed July 26, 2007

Page 5 of 7

REMARKS

This document is filed in reply to the final Office Action dated June 9, 2010 ("Office Action")

Applicants have amended claim 34 so that it no longer depends from claim 33. which in turn depends from claim 1. Thus, support for this amendment can be found in claim 33 (now cancelled) and claim 1 (previously cancelled). Applicants have also cancelled claims 35-37 and 59-77 herein. Note that claims 2-32 and 38-58, like claim 1, were previously cancelled.

Further, Applicants have added new claims 78-96, which merely recite one or more limitations already recited in claim 34 or claim 35 (now cancelled).

Applicants submit that all the amendments should be entered as they raise no new issues that will require further consideration or search and also do not touch the merits of the application within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b).

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 34 and 78-96 will be pending and under examination. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner acknowledges that claims 34 and 35 contain allowable subject matter but objects to them for depending from a rejected base claim. See the Office Action, page 7, first paragraph.

Applicants have rewritten claim 34 in independent form so as not to depend from a rejected claim. Claim 34, as amended, is now in condition for allowance.

New Claims

New claims 78-86 are each a subset of the allowable subject matter of claim 34. These claims are therefore in condition for allowance. By the same token, claims 87-96 are each a subset of the allowable subject matter of claim 35 (now cancelled) and thus are also in condition for allowance. Of note, new claims 87 and 94, which, in combination, are identical in scope to allowable, cancelled claim 35.

Applicant : ARDYTHE L. MORROW Attorney Docket No.: 50051-002\US1

Serial No. : 10/581,759 Client Ref. No.: 2003-1201
Filed : July 26, 2007

Page : 6 of 7

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 33, 36, 37, and 59-61 are rejected for lack of enablement. See the Office Action, page 2, third paragraph.

These claims have been cancelled, thus obviating the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 70-77 are rejected as being anticipated by US Patent 6,045,854 to Prieto et al. See the Office Action, page 4, third paragraph.

These claims have been cancelled, thus obviating the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 62-77 are rejected for obviousness over US Patent Application 2002/0019991 by Prieto et al. See the Office Action, page 5, first paragraph.

These claims have been cancelled, thus obviating the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment.

In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : ARDYTHE L. MORROW Attorney Docket No.: 50051-002US1 Client Ref. No.: 2003-1201

Serial No. 10/581,759 Filed July 26, 2007

Page 7 of 7

No fee is believed due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 50051-002US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney at Law Reg. No. 34,053

Customer No. 69713 Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP 10 Fawcett Street Cambridge, MA 02138

Telephone: (617) 500-2503 Facsimile: (617) 500-2499

162537.doc